

authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-8323 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-8324 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-8330 Filed 3-30-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96-366-009]

Florida Gas Transmission Company, Notice of Report of Refunds

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 20, 1998, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT) tendered for filing with a supplemental refund report reflecting amounts refunded to its transportation customers on February 20, 1998.

FGT states that on December 15, 1997 FGT refunded amounts to its customers in compliance with Article XI of the rate case settlement in Docket No. RP96-366-005. Subsequently it came to FGT's attention that FGT inadvertently failed to calculate refunds related to: (1) The transportation component of the cash-out price applicable to net delivery point overage imbalances pursuant to the cash-out mechanism of Section 14 of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) of FGT's Tariff, and (2) reservation charge credits resulting from a one-time shortening of the gas day of April 5, 1997 due to FGT's implementation of Gas Industry Standards Board (GISB) Standard 1.3.1. On January 27, 1998 FGT filed a letter with the Commission stating that FGT would make additional refunds related to both of the above, inclusive of interest, and would file a supplemental refund report within 30 days of the date additional refunds were made.

FGT states that the supplemental refunds, totaling \$285,656 inclusive of interest, were mailed to customers on February 20, 1998. FGT is filing the attached supplemental refund report as stated in the January 27 letter.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be filed on or before April 1, 1998. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. SA98-74-000]

George Grenyo; Notice of Petition for Adjustment

March 25, 1998.

Take notice that on March 16, 1998, George Grenyo (Grenyo) filed a petition for adjustment, pursuant to section 502(c) of the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 [15 U.S.C. 3142(c) (1982)], requesting to be relieved of his obligation to pay Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company (Panhandle) the Kansas ad valorem tax refunds for the royalty interests attributable to Grenyo's working interest in the Ormiston Lease, otherwise required by the Commission's September 10, 1997 order in Docket No. RP97-369-000 *et al.*,¹ on remand from the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.² Grenyo's petition indicates that he has already paid Panhandle \$126.25, and that this sum includes unspecified amounts attributable to royalty interests in the Ormiston Lease. Grenyo's petition is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said petition should on or before 15 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214, 385.211, 385.1105, and 385.1106). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene

¹ See 80 FERC ¶ 61,264 (1997); order denying reh'g issued January 28, 1998, 82 FERC ¶ 61,058 (1998).

² *Public Service Company of Colorado v. FERC*, 91 F.3d 1478 (D.C. 1996), cert. denied, Nos. 96-954 and 96-1230 (65 U.S.L.W. 3751 and 3754, May 12, 1997) (Public Service).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Project Nos. 2004-073 and 11607-000]

Holyoke Water Power Company, City of Holyoke, Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant, and Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company; Notice Granting Extension of Time to File Better Adapted Statements for the Holyoke Project

March 26, 1998.

On October 9, 1997, the Commission issued its Notice Establishing Subsequent Licensing Procedural Schedule and a Deadline for Submission of Final Amendments in the above-captioned proceedings. Among other things, the Notice's schedule established a March 31, 1998 deadline for the competing applicants to file a detailed and complete statement of how its plans are as well, or better, adapted than the plans of each of the other license applications to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest, the water resources of the region, per Section 4.36(d)(2)(iii) of the Commission's regulations.

On March 24, 1998, the Holyoke Water Power Company (HWP) filed a motion requesting an extension of time to file its "better adapted" statement for the Holyoke Project. As described below, HWP requested an extension of the March 31 deadline, for a period not to exceed 90 days, or until June 30, 1998. In its motion, HWP cites the deficiencies in the competing applicant's application (herein referred to as the City of Holyoke), as the reason for extending the deadline to file the "better adapted" statements. Most notably, HWP references the City of Holyoke's proposal to install additional capacity at the project.

HWP contends that the City of Holyoke's proposal to install additional capacity is an integral part of the City of Holyoke's application. In light of this, HWP argues that until the aforementioned deficiencies are corrected, it will be unclear as to what the City of Holyoke is proposing in its application with respect to the installation of additional capacity. Moreover, HWP argues that such an omission on the part of the City of